

Serial Number: 10/604,756  
Filed: 8/14/2003

**BARBLOCH IP**

### Remarks

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the eIDS form 1449 initialed and returned by the Examiner, copy attached. The citation number 11 for US Design Patent No. 401592 to Nishimura et al. is not initialed. Please review the cited reference and acknowledge same by returning a copy of the eIDS form 1449 with this reference initialed. Because this reference was submitted in the original eIDS, formatted according to the USPTO EFS software requirements and acknowledged as received by the USPTO EFS, this is a timely request and therefore no copy of the patent document or IDS fee is required.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 9 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as unpatentable by *Sharman*. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the specification and plain language of claims 1-3 and 9 in which it is a "**radome** for a reflector antenna having a reflector with a vertex area" which is described in detail and claimed. The Examiner appears to have erroneously applied structure of the *Sharman* reflector 10 and sub reflector 13 to the present claim. The plain language of the claim requires a **radome** having elements of a central portion and an outer portion, the central portion of the **radome** adapted to focus a reflected component of an RF signal from an associated reflector antenna to the vertex area of the reflector antenna. This claimed structure fails to appear in the cited reference.

Serial Number: 10/604,756  
Filed: 8/14/2003

**LABLOCK IP**

With respect to the various claims 18-22 what is claimed is an antenna with a radome adapted for connection to a reflector by mating the radome to the reflector and then **rotating the radome relative to the reflector** to achieve the interconnection. With respect to *Sharman*, the Examiner correctly indicates that the radome is attached by multiple screws (col.3, ln.44-47). Multiple screw interconnection is clearly not a connection obtained by mating the radome to the reflector and then rotating the radome relative to the reflector because it requires the radome to be fixed in place while each screw is individually screwed into place.

As each and every element of the present non-obvious invention fails to appear in the cited reference, rejection of claims 1-3, 9 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as unpatentable by *Pittman*. The Examiner indicates that *Pittman* discloses "...a reflector (122) with a vertex area, comprising: a radome (120) adapted to cover an open end of the reflector'..." (OA1: para. 3 page. 3). In fact, the "radome (120)" identified by the Examiner is a general reference to the antenna system (120) appearing in figure 8 which *Pittman* indicates may be covered by a radome, not shown or described (col.7, ln 23-27). Applicant respectfully submits that *Pittman* discloses nothing whatsoever with respect to a radome adapted to cover the open end of the reflector of a reflector antenna. As each and every element

Serial Number: 10/604,756  
Filed: 8/14/2003

**BARBLOCH IP**

of the present non-obvious invention fails to appear in the cited reference, rejection of claims 10-12 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Sharman* in view of *Pittman*. Immediately after listing the references applied in the Examiner's rejection of claims 4-6 (OA1: para.4, page 4), the Examiner references claims 4-8 and 19 (although claim 7 is later described as being allowable if placed into independent form). Applicant has disregarded the second claims listing as erroneous. If this is incorrect, please advise the basis of each additional rejection (claims 7,8 and 19) with particularity, as required.

As described herein above, the Examiners application of the cited references is erroneous. The Examiner continues to apply the same erroneous elements in the present rejection. As the independent claim 1 from which claims 4-6 depend is believed to be allowable, these dependent claims thereof should also be allowable. Because each and every element of the claimed invention fails to be disclosed, taught or suggested in the cited references, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner indicates that claims 7 and 13 would be allowable if placed in independent form. However, as described herein above, the independent claims from which these claims depend are believed to be allowable, therefore these dependent claims should also be allowable in their present form.


Serial Number: 10/604,756  
Filed: 8/14/2003

**BABCOCK IP**

No rejection was made with respect to claim 8. If the Examiner cannot describe the basis of a rejection for claim 8 with particularity, the Examiner should indicate that claim 8 is allowed.

Having obviated each of the Examiners rejections, applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Because each of the rejections herein have been shown to be erroneous, it would be improper for the next official action, if not a notice of allowance, to be a final action. Should the Examiner be inclined to issue an Official Action other than the notice of allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner first contact Applicant by telephone at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew Babcock, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, LLC  
24154 Lakeside Dr.  
Lake Zurich, IL 60047  
Telephone: 847 719-2063  
Fax: 847 438-5743

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No 703 872-9306) on September 27, 2004.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew D. Babcock